

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application, and Claims 10 – 13 were previously cancelled.

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 9 and 14 – 20 were amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this Amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-13 and 19-20

Claims 1-13 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Boltz, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,731 in view of *Corrigan, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,097). Although Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 14 - 19 are amended to clarify the invention and remove any ambiguities that may have been the basis for this claim rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing system which comprises a first information processing apparatus, a *plurality of* second information processing *apparatuses*, *each* installed in *one of* a plurality of areas, for authenticating the first information processing apparatus in a predetermined area of the plurality of areas, and a third information processing apparatus for providing content to the first information processing apparatus.

In a relevant part, Claim 1 requires that the third information processing apparatus sends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus, determines whether the authentication information received from first information processing apparatus satisfies a predetermined input format, and based on a satisfactory determination selects *one of the plurality of second information processing apparatuses based on* the predetermined area information obtained from the first information processing apparatus and sends the authentication information obtained from the first information processing apparatus to the selected second information processing apparatus via the network, and based on a non-satisfactory determination resends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus. Each of the plurality of second information processing apparatuses is installed in one of a plurality of areas.

As such, the relationship of the third information processing apparatus with the plurality of second information processing apparatuses is a one-to-many relationship, and the area information obtained from the first information processing apparatus enables the third information processing apparatus to select one second information processing apparatus from the plurality of second information processing apparatuses.

This is clearly unlike *Boltz* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other. The Examiner states that in *Boltz* the Base Station (third information processing apparatus) 24 selects the Mobile Switching Center (MSC)/Visitor Location Register (VLR) areas (second information processing apparatus) 12. However, *Boltz* states that (emphasis added):

“With reference to FIG. 1 of the drawings, there is illustrated a Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN), such as cellular network 10, which in turn is composed of a plurality of areas 12, each with a Mobile Switching Center (MSC) 14 and an integrated Visitor Location Register (VLR) 16 therein. The MSC/VLR areas 12, in turn, include a plurality of Location Areas (LA) 18, which is defined as that part of a given MSC/VLR area 12 in which a mobile station (MS) 20 may move freely without having to send update location information to the MSC/VLR area 12 that controls that LA 18. *Each Location Area 12 is divided into a number of cells 22.* Mobile Station 20 is the physical equipment, e.g., a car phone or other portable phone, used by mobile subscribers to communicate with the cellular network 10. *A Base Station (BS) 24 is the physical equipment, illustrated for simplicity as a radio tower, that provides radio coverage to the geographical area of the cell 22 in which to handle radio traffic to and from the MS 20.*”

See Column 2, lines 45 – 62. That is, in *Boltz* the third information processing apparatus (BS) 24 is in communication with only one second information processing apparatus (MSC/VLR) 12, and therefore does not perform a selection from a plurality of second information processing apparatuses, as required by Claim 1. Further, *Corrigan* also does not teach or suggest a third information processing apparatus that selects one second information processing apparatus from a plurality of second information processing apparatuses.

Moreover, as claimed the third information processing apparatus sends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus, and determines whether the authentication information received from the first information processing apparatus satisfies a predetermined input format. Further, the selected second information processing apparatus

authenticates the first information processing apparatus on the basis of the authentication information received from the third information processing apparatus and sends authentication result information for the first information processing apparatus to the third information processing apparatus.

That is, a format check on the authentication information is performed by the third information processing apparatus and if the authentication information satisfies the format check, then an authentication check is performed by the second information processing apparatus. In other words, two separate checks are performed by two distinct information processing apparatuses.

This is clearly unlike *Boltz* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other. The Examiner acknowledged that *Boltz* fails to disclose that the third information processing apparatus 24 sends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus 20 and determines whether the authentication information received from first information processing apparatus 20 satisfies a predetermined input format, but asserted that *Corrigan* allegedly does and pointed to FIG. 3 and column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 8 for support.

However, each of *Boltz* and *Corrigan* fails to teach or suggest that a format check is performed by the third information processing apparatus and an authentication check is performed by the second information processing apparatus.

In fact, *Boltz* discloses that the third information processing apparatus 24 only forwards the registration message to the second information processing apparatus (MSC/VLR) 12 without performing any format check, and *Corrigan* discloses in the disclosure section selected by the Examiner that (emphasis added):

“The node 1 also interfaces on the Internet side with a WAP gateway, and signaling sequences are illustrated in FIG. 3. *A mobile user service request reaches the node as a URL request in http format, and the node presents a login screen. The user inputs access security codes and the node interfaces on the Internet side to have the required content delivered in HTML format and relayed to the user in WML format.* This is a full request, but the node also handles push data transfers. Indeed an important aspect to the node is that it provides a variety of services as required by users in a versatile manner.”

That is, in *Corrigan*, the node 1 presents a login screen (authentication screen), receives authentication information and sends the request to the Web server in an HTML format. Therefore, *Corrigan* teaches performing only one authentication check, if any, by the node 1.

Thus, both *Boltz* and *Corrigan* disclose or suggest only one apparatus to authenticate the authentication information, but they do not disclose or suggest another distinct apparatus which checks whether the authentication information satisfies a predetermined input format before another apparatus authenticates it.

As such, Claim 1 is patentable over *Boltz* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other, as are dependent Claims 1 – 4, for at least the same reasons.

Independent Claims 5, 9, 14, 18 and 19, which also recite the same distinguishable limitation at that of Claim 1, are also patentable over *Boltz* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other, as are their corresponding dependent Claims for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 14-18

Claims 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al. (“*Higuchi*”) (U.S. Publication No. 2003-0050050) in view of *Corrigan*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 14 and 18 recite the same distinguishable limitation as that of Claim 1, discussed above.

As stated above, *Corrigan* fails to teach or suggest that the third information processing apparatus sends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus, determines whether the authentication information received from first information processing apparatus satisfies a predetermined input format, and based on a satisfactory determination selects one of the plurality of second information processing apparatuses based on the predetermined area information obtained from the first information processing apparatus and sends the authentication information obtained from the first information processing apparatus to the selected second information processing apparatus via the

network, and based on a non-satisfactory determination resends the authentication screen information to the first information processing apparatus. The selected second information processing apparatus authenticates the first information processing apparatus on the basis of the authentication information received from the third information processing apparatus and sends authentication result information for the first information processing apparatus to the third information processing apparatus, as required by Claim 1. Moreover, in addition to *Corrigan*, *Higuchi* also fails to teach or suggest this distinguishable limitation.

As such, Claims 14 and 18 are patentable over *Higuchi* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other, as are their dependent Claims, if any, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 15, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000